



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME *CILICIA*.

The first certain appearance of the name *Cilicia* is in the cuneiform inscriptions of Tiglathpileser III (not IV), where *Hilakku* refers to the mountainous district later occupied by the Isaurians¹ and the southwestern corner of Cappadocia, a connotation which the word still possessed in classical times, though the modern definition was already coming into use. In the Hittite texts of the second millennium, southeastern Cilicia is called *Arzawa*, Babylonian *Ursu*, a name which survived in classical *Rhosus* (not *Arsus*²) and modern *Arsus*. Some centuries later, we find that this district is called in the Assyrian and Aramean inscriptions, as well as in the Old Testament by the name *Quweh* (*Que*, *Qwh*).

On Persian coins of Cilicia we find usually the form *𐎠𐎵𐎷𐎡*, corresponding to the Assyrian, but on coins of the satrap Pharnabazus the orthography *𐎠𐎵𐎷𐎡* occurs instead. The latter spelling cannot be explained by the Greek *Κιλικία*, but both evidently have a common source, older than the dissimilated form *Hlk*, though both forms may have existed side by side for many centuries. There is, therefore, no phonetic objection to the identification of the *Kl(r)kš*, who appear among the Anatolian peoples who

¹ The antiquity of the name Isaurian is confirmed by the recent discovery in the Boghaz-keui collections of the classical *Garsaura*, northwest of Tyana, as *Kursaura*, in a text purporting to describe events of the thirtieth century B.C. The element *saur* thus belongs to the primitive Cappadocian language, probably the prefixing Eteo-Hittite (a better term than Proto-Hittite) language described by Forrer.

² This "classical" form has been invented by Professor Sayce; see *Jour. Eg. Arch.*, VI, 296. The relation between the various writings *Ursu*, *Uršu*, and *Arzawa* has been pointed out by the writer in *Jour. Eg. Arch.*, VII, 80 f., unfortunately without noting Sayce's blunder. Another, much more portentous mistake of the same kind (*loc. cit.*) is Sayce's statement that *Yarmuti* is "classical" *Armuthia*. The source of this is Tompkins, *Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, IX, 242, *ad* 218 (of the Tuthmosis list): "Mauti. Perhaps the Yari-muta of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, now (I think) *Armuthia*, south of Killis." This is the modern village of *Armūdja*, a hamlet some three miles south of Killis, not on the coast at all, but in the heart of Syria, and with no known classical background.

threatened Egypt in the thirteenth century, with the Cilicians; the ending *š* is, as is well-known, a gentilic ending (cf. *Jour. Pal. Orient. Soc.* I, 57, n. 2). On the other hand, we must now distinguish between the *Klkš*-Cilicians and the Teucrian Ger-githes, who appear on the Egean coast of Asia Minor and in Cyprus, though the latter may well be identical with the Gir-gashites of Canaan.

Attention may be called, in this connection, to the name *Halikalbat*, the archaic designation of the district later known as *Melid*, Greek *Melitene*, which extended, like *Katmuḥ* or *Kutmuḥ* (Commagene) on both sides of the Euphrates. The name is written *Hanigalbat* (formerly read *Hanirabbat*), *Ḥaligalbat[û]* (Scheil, *Délégation en Perse*, II, 95 f.) and *Ḥanakalbat*. The native form, in the text of the Mitannian Agabtaḥa, was *Ḥali-g(k)albat*; *Hanigalbat* and *Ḥanakalbat* are the Babylonian forms, which unquestionably originated in the dissimilation of the first *l*. Schroeder's artificial suggestion, *Orient. Lit.*, 1918, 175, that *LI* had a "*Ḥanigalbatean*" reading *ana* is impossible, as well as wholly gratuitous. It is barely possible that the correct form, *Ḥalikalbat*, should be analyzed as *Ḥalik-albat*, and combined with *Kilik-Hilak*, Cilicia. However, one must not forget the fate of an older hypothesis of this type, combining *Hanigalbat*, read *Hanirabbat*, with *Ḥana* = 'Anah, as "Great Ḥana."

W. F. ALBRIGHT.

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH,
JERUSALEM, PALESTINE.